



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	Э.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/769,851		01/25/2001	Timo Saarnimo	208285	5503	
21831	7590	12/09/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		ASKIN, P.C.	PAN, YUWEN			
		THE AMERICAS, 15 10036-5803	in FLOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2682		
				DATE MAIL ED: 12/09/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/769,851	SAARNIMO, TIMO	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yuwen Pan	2682	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejections.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>26 October 2004</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			orth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	·	,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appl	roved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•		
10. Other:			

VIVIAN CHIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: although the applicant argues that prior of record doesn't teach that a loop antenna wherein the first plane is substantially conplanar with the second plane, first of all, according to the specification, the cirucit substrate 11 and the loop antenna 10 do not have to be exactly on the same plane (see page 4, lines 19-23), second Bolanos does teach that part of the loop antenna (see figure 5 and 6 item 426) is planar with the circuit substrate. Therefore, the prior art clearly teaches all the limitation as claims, all the limitations as argued are nevertheless being met and addressed in the previous final rejection, dated 4/19/04. Therefore, applicant's arguments are deemed not persuasive.